

Case No. UC0362USNA  
Application No. 10/802,704

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

Applicants' Remarks

*Claim Amendments*

JAN 12 2007

Claim 1 is being amended to advance the prosecution on the merits by specifying that the electrically conductive composition has pH in the range of from 2 to 8. No new matter is being added. The amendment is supported in the application at page 18, line 31 to page 20, line 26, page 21, lines 8-14, page 28, lines 8-18, page 34, lines 16-17, page 40, line 38 to page 41, line 2, Fig. 8(a) – 8(d) and Fig. 9(a) – 9(d).

*Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102 or, alternatively, 103*

Claim 1 is the only independent claim. The dependent claims depend therefrom and further limit the independent claim and thereby further distinguish over the references. Applicants respectfully submit that the current amendment to claim 1 either overcomes or renders moot the alternative rejections. Neither EP 0 593 111 (the '111 application) nor Pickup specify a pH range for the materials disclosed, and neither teach or suggest that elevating the pH of the dispersion will desirably enhance device characteristics and performance. In addition, with respect to claim 4, stable aqueous dispersions using colloidal perfluorosulfonic acids are unexpected at any pH, but particularly elevated pH levels. Please see, for example, the Applicants' specification at page 5, line 35, to page 6, line 2, and Table 1, page 41.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's finding in the January 23, 2006 office action (page 9, lines 1-2) that the '111 application specifically or inherently meets each of the claimed limitations in that this reference does not disclose fluorinated or perfluorinated polymeric sulfonic acids. Accordingly, there is no disclosure in the '111 application of a polythiophene-Nafion® dispersion. Pickup discloses PEDOT/Nafion® but there is no disclosure of a pH range in that reference.

Both references disclose compositions comprising a conductive polymer and a polymeric styrene sulfonic acid. Applicants' co-pending application 10/669,494, a priority application for this case, summarizes comparative results for PEDT/PSSA and PEDT/Nafion® devices, on page 42, lines 4-6 thereof (PEDT/PSSA gives good lifetime only for narrow pH range, < 2.5, whereas PEDT/Nafion® devices operate over a much wider pH range, at least 1.8 to 7.0). Therefore, it would not have been within the inherent knowledge of one skilled in the art to adjust pH to achieve superior device results, nor

Page 5 of 6

Case No. UC0362USNA  
Application No. 10/802,704

JAN 12 2007

would it have been obvious based on a reading of the '111 application in conjunction with Pickup.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

Applicants respectfully submit that the foregoing amendments in light of the remarks presented above and submission of a terminal disclaimer overcome the rejections in the August 2, 2006 office action as maintained in the October 12, 2006 advisory opinion and place the pending claims in condition for allowance. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner have questions about the content of this paper or the status of the application, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' counsel at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



John H. Lamming  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 34,857  
Telephone: 302-992-5877  
Facsimile: 302-892-1026

Date: January 12, 2007